

SALMON AND STEELHEAD HABITAT LIMITING FACTORS IN WRIA 1, THE NOOKSACK BASIN

July, 2002



Carol J. Smith, Ph.D.
Washington State Conservation Commission
300 Desmond Drive
Lacey, Washington 98503

Acknowledgements

This report was developed by the WRIA 1 Technical Advisory Group for Habitat Limiting Factors. This project would not have been possible without their vast expertise and willingness to contribute. The following participants in this project are gratefully thanked and include:

Bruce Barbour, DOE
Alan Chapman, Lummi Indian Nation
Treva Coe, Nooksack Indian Tribe
Wendy Cole, Whatcom Conservation District
Ned Currence, Nooksack Indian Tribe
Gregg Dunphy, Lummi Indian Nation
Clare Fogelsong, City of Bellingham
John Gillies, U.S.D.A.
Darrell Gray, NSEA
Brady Green, U.S. Forest Service
Dale Griggs, Nooksack Indian Tribe
Milton Holter, Lummi Indian Nation
Doug Huddle, WDFW
Tim Hyatt, Nooksack Indian Tribe
Mike MacKay, Lummi Indian Nation
Mike Maudlin, Lummi Indian Nation
Shannon Moore, NSEA
Roger Nichols, U.S. Forest Service
Andrew Phay, Whatcom Conservation District
Dr. Carol Smith, WA Conservation Commission
Steve Seymour, WDFW
John Thompson, Whatcom County
Tyson Waldo, NWIFC SSHIAP
Bob Warinner, WDFW
Barry Wenger, DOE
Brian Williams, WDFW
Stan Zyskowski, National Park Service

A special thanks to Ron McFarlane (NWIFC) for digitizing and producing maps, to Andrew Phay (Whatcom Conservation District) for supplying numerous figures, to Llyn Doremus (Nooksack Indian Tribe) for the review, and to Victor Johnson (Lummi Indian Nation) for supplying the slope instability figure. I also extend appreciation to Devin Smith (NWIFC) and Kurt Fresh (WDFW) for compiling and developing the habitat rating standards, and to Ed Manary for writing the “Habitat Limiting Factors Background”.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
LIST OF FIGURES	6
LIST OF TABLES	11
LIST OF MAPS	12
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	13
Introduction	13
Major Habitat Problems in the Nooksack Basin	13
Major Habitat Problems in the Dakota, California, Terrell, Squalicum, Whatcom, Padden, Chuckanut, Oyster, and Colony Creek Watersheds	15
Major Habitat Problems in the Fraser River Tributaries	16
Habitat Impacts in the WRIA 1 Estuarine and Nearshore Environments	16
Conclusion	17
INTRODUCTION	18
Habitat Limiting Factors Background	18
The Relative Role Of Habitat In Healthy Populations Of Natural Spawning Salmon	18
Introduction to Habitat Impacts	25
WATERSHED DESCRIPTION AND CONDITION FOR STREAMS IN WRIA 1	27
Introduction	27
Watershed Description and Land Use in Dakota, California, and Terrell Creeks	28
Watershed Description and Land Use in the Sumas River, Chilliwack River, and Damfino, Tomyhoi, Frost, and Silesia Creeks (Washington State Fraser River Tributaries)	28
Watershed Description and Land Use in the Nooksack Basin including the Lummi River	29

Watershed Description and Land Use in Squalicum, Whatcom, Padden, and Lake Whatcom Watersheds.....	37
Watershed Description and Land Use in Chuckanut, Oyster, and Colony Creeks.....	40
Watershed Description and Land Use along the Estuarine and Near Shore Environments of WRIA 1	42
DISTRIBUTION AND CONDITION OF SALMONID STOCKS IN WRIA 1.....	44
Nooksack Basin Salmonid Stocks.....	44
Salmonid Stock Status in the Smaller Independent Watersheds of WRIA 1	51
WRIA 1 HABITAT LIMITING FACTORS BY SUB-BASIN.....	55
Categories of Habitat Limiting Factors used by the Washington State Conservation Commission	55
Rating Habitat Conditions.....	57
Habitat Limiting Factors in the Nooksack Basin including the Lummi River.....	58
Loss of Fish Access in the Nooksack Basin and the Lummi River	58
Floodplain Conditions in the Nooksack Basin including the Lummi River	82
Streambed and Sediment Conditions In the Nooksack Basin and the Lummi River.....	90
Riparian Conditions in the Nooksack Basin including the Lummi River.....	146
Water Quality Conditions in the Nooksack Basin including the Lummi River.....	163
Water Quantity Conditions in the Nooksack Basin including the Lummi River.....	173
Habitat Limiting Factors in Dakota, California, and Terrell Creeks.....	189
Habitat Limiting Factors in Squalicum, Whatcom, Padden, and Chuckanut Creeks and the Lake Whatcom Watershed	195
Habitat Limiting Factors in Oyster and Colony Creeks.....	213
Habitat Limiting Factors in the Sumas River, Chilliwack River, and Damfino, Tomyhoi, Frost, and Silesia Creeks (Washington State Fraser River Tributaries).....	216
The Condition of Estuarine and Nearshore Habitat in WRIA 1	223

ASSESSMENT OF HABITAT LIMITING FACTORS	248
RECOMMENDATIONS AND DATA GAPS FOR WRIA 1 HABITAT LIMITING FACTORS.....	273
Introduction	273
Recommendations and Data Needs for Salmonid Habitat Restoration Actions in the Nooksack Basin.....	273
Recommendations and Data Needs for Salmonid Habitat Restoration Actions in the Lummi River and tributaries	279
Recommendations and Data Needs for Salmonid Habitat Restoration Actions in Dakota, California, and Terrell Creeks	281
Recommendations and Data Needs for Salmonid Habitat Restoration Actions in Squalicum, Whatcom, Padden, Chuckanut, Oyster, and Colony Creeks and the Lake Whatcom Tributaries.....	284
Recommendations and Data Needs for the Fraser River Tributaries in Washington State.....	288
WRIA 1 Estuary and Near Shore Action Recommendations and Data Needs	292
LITERATURE CITED	295
APPENDIX 1 – NOOKSACK BASIN STREAM CHANNEL TYPES AND SLOPE STABILITY DATA.....	316
APPENDIX 2 – WATERSHED DELINEATIONS FOR THE ROAD DENSITY ANALYSIS BASED UPON THE WRIA 1 WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PROCESS.....	320
GLOSSARY	322
DISCLAIMER.....	325

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Gradient and Channel Confinement Designations in the North and Middle Fork Nooksack Rivers (SSHIAP 1995 to present).	31
Figure 2. Gradient and Channel Confinement Designations in the South Fork Nooksack River (SSHIAP 1995 to present).	34
Figure 3. Gradient and Channel Confinement Designations in the Nooksack and Lummi Rivers (SSHIAP 1995 to present).	36
Figure 4. Gradient and Channel Confinement Designations in Squalicum, Whatcom, Padden, and Chuckanut Creeks (SSHIAP 1995 to present).	39
Figure 5. Gradient and Channel Confinement Designations in Oyster and Colony Creeks (SSHIAP 1995 to present).	41
Figure 6a (top). 1895 map of the mainstem Nooksack River by David B. Ogden. Figure 6b (bottom). Current map of the mainstem Nooksack River with levees highlighted in red (data from Whatcom Dept. Public Works 1999).	87
Figure 7. Known wetland habitat in WRIA 1. (NWI Wetland data, mapped by Andrew Phay, Whatcom Conservation District March 2000).	88
Figure 8. Hydric soils in WRIA 1. (NRCS, mapped by Andrew Phay, Whatcom Conservation District June 2001).	89
Figure 9. Land use in the Nooksack Basin. (map by Andrew Phay, Whatcom Conservation District 2000).	92
Figure 10. Slope stability in the Nooksack Basin (map from Victor Johnson, Lummi Indian Nation using DNR SHALSTAB model)	95
Figure 11. Landslide density (number of events per square mile) in the North Fork Nooksack Basin (data from Watts 1997).	96
Figure 12. Areas of the Nooksack Basin at high risk of mass wasting due to roads (map from Andrew Phay, Whatcom Conservation District 2000, data from Zander 1996, 1997, 1998).	97
Figure 13. Road density in the upper North Fork Nooksack watersheds (data from T. Coe, Nooksack Indian Tribe combining Zander 1997 road data with the GIS watersheds from the WRIA 1 Watershed Management Process)..	99

Figure 14. Road density in the upper North Fork Nooksack watersheds (data from T. Coe, Nooksack Indian Tribe combining Zander 1997 road data with the GIS	101
Figure 15. Road density in North Fork Nooksack watersheds (data from T. Coe, Nooksack Indian Tribe combining Zander 1997 road data with the GIS watersheds from the WRIA 1 Watershed Management Process).	103
Figure 16. Road density in the Canyon Creek (NF Nooksack) watersheds (data from T. Coe, Nooksack Indian Tribe combining Zander 1997 road data with the GIS watersheds from the WRIA 1 Watershed Management Process.....	109
Figure 17. Road density in North Fork Nooksack watersheds (data from T. Coe, Nooksack Indian Tribe combining Zander 1997 road data with the GIS watersheds	110
Figure 18. Road density in lower North Fork Nooksack watersheds and Smith Creek (data from T. Coe, Nooksack Indian Tribe combining Zander 1997 road data with the GIS watersheds from the WRIA 1 Watershed Management Process.....	114
Figure 19. Landslide density (number of events per square mile) in the Middle Fork Nooksack Basin (Watts 1998).	118
Figure 20. Road density in lower Middle Fork Nooksack watersheds (data from T. Coe, Nooksack Indian Tribe combining Zander 1997 road data with the GIS watersheds from the WRIA 1 Watershed Management Process	121
Figure 21. Road density in the Middle Fork Nooksack watersheds (data from T. Coe, Nooksack Indian Tribe combining Zander 1997 road data with the GIS watersheds from the WRIA 1 Watershed Management Process).....	123
Figure 22. Road density in the upper Middle Fork Nooksack watersheds (data from T. Coe, Nooksack Indian Tribe combining Zander 1997 road data with the GIS watersheds from the WRIA 1 Watershed Management Process).	124
Figure 23. Road density in the upper Middle Fork Nooksack watersheds (data from T. Coe, Nooksack Indian Tribe combining Zander 1997 road data with the GIS watersheds from the WRIA 1 Watershed Management Process).	126
Figure 24. Landslide density (total number of slides per square mile) in the South Fork Nooksack Basin (data from Hale 1992; DNR 1994; Lunetta et al. 1997; DNR 1998; Benda and Coho 1999 draft).....	129

Figure 25. Road density in the lower South Fork Nooksack watersheds (data from T. Coe, Nooksack Indian Tribe combining Zander 1997 road data with the GIS watersheds from the WRIA 1 Watershed Management Process.....	133
Figure 26. Road density in South Fork Nooksack watersheds (data from T. Coe, Nooksack Indian Tribe combining Zander 1997 road data with the GIS watersheds from the WRIA 1 Watershed Management Process.....	136
Figure 27. Landslide density (number of landslides per square mile) in the Skookum and Edfro Watersheds (data from DNR 1994).	137
Figure 28. Road density in the upper South Fork Nooksack watersheds (data from T. Coe, Nooksack Indian Tribe combining Zander 1997 road data with the GIS watersheds from the WRIA 1 Watershed Management Process.....	141
Figure 29. Riparian vegetation in the WAUs of the mainstem Nooksack River and tributaries (data from Lunetta et al. 1997).....	151
Figure 30. Riparian vegetation in the WAUs of the North Fork Nooksack River (data from Lunetta et al. 1997).....	156
Figure 31. Riparian vegetation in the WAUs of the Middle Fork Nooksack River (data from Lunetta et al. 1997).....	159
Figure 32. Riparian vegetation types in the WAUs of the South Fork Nooksack Sub-Basin (data from Lunetta et al. 1997).	163
Figure 33. Sites of known water quality impairments within WRIA 1 are marked with red circles. These impairments include those that directly impact salmonids, such as water temperature, dissolved oxygen, sediment, ammonia, and nitrate (data from various sources described in text).....	165
Figure 34. Map of land cover vegetation ratings for WRIA 1	175
Figure 35. Streams outlined in red denote waters that are closed to further water allocations (data from DOE 1995).	176
Figure 36. Water use in WRIA 1 by user type based upon instantaneous quantity of water allowed for withdrawal (data from DOE 1995).....	177
Figure 37. Draft water right applications, permits, and certificates (DOE 1995).	180
Figure 38. Land cover vegetation in the WAUs of the mainstem Nooksack sub-basin (data from Lunetta et al. 1997).	181

Figure 39. Land cover vegetation in the North Fork Nooksack WAUs (data from Lunetta et al. 1997).....	183
Figure 40. Percent of mature land cover vegetation in the middle region of the North Fork Nooksack sub-basin (data from DNR 1995).	184
Figure 41. Land cover vegetation in the Middle Fork Nooksack River WAUs (data from Lunetta et al. 1997).....	186
Figure 42. Land cover vegetation in the South Fork Nooksack WAUs (data from Lunetta et al. 1997.	188
Figure 43. Land cover vegetation conditions in the Skookum Creek WAU (data from DNR 1994)..	189
Figure 44. Riparian vegetation type in the Birch Bay and Drayton Harbor WAUs data from Lunetta et al. 1997).....	192
Figure 45. Land cover vegetation in the Terrell, Dakota, and California Creek WAUs (data from Lunetta et al. 1997).....	195
Figure 46. Riparian vegetation in the Silver/Squalicum WAU and the Whatcom/Padden/Chuckanut WAU (data from Lunetta et al. 1997).	205
Figure 47. Riparian vegetation in the Lake Whatcom WAU (data from Lunetta et al. 1997).....	206
Figure 48. Land cover vegetation in the Silver, Squalicum, Whatcom, Padden, and Chuckanut Creek WAUs (data from Lunetta et al. 1997).	212
Figure 49. Percent of hydrologically mature land cover in the watersheds draining into Lake Whatcom (data from DNR 1997).	213
Figure 50. Riparian vegetation in the Oyster and Colony Creek WAU (data from Lunetta et al. 1997).....	215
Figure 51. Land cover vegetation in the Oyster and Colony Creek WAU (data from Lunetta et al. 1997).....	216
Figure 52. Riparian vegetation by WAU in the Sumas and Chilliwack Rivers and tributaries (data from Lunetta et al. 1997).....	220
Figure 53. Land cover vegetation in the Sumas and Chilliwack River and tributaries (data from Lunetta et al. 1997).....	223
Figure 54. Shoreline modifications in WRIA 1 (data from Berry et al. 2001).	230
Figure 55. Shoreline modification in WRIA 1 (data from Berry et al. 2001).....	231

Figure 56. Locations of eelgrass beds, algae, and substrate types in WRIA 1 (Figure from Andrew Phay, Whatcom Conservation District, 2000).	234
Figure 57. Percent of overhanging riparian vegetation along shorelines in WRIA 1 (data from Berry et al. 2001).	237
Figure 58. Percent of overhanging riparian vegetation along shorelines in WRIA 1 (data from Berry et al. 2001).	238
Figure 59. Potential contaminant sources in Bellingham Bay (Figure from Pacific International Engineering and Anchor Environmental 1999).	243
Figure 60. Proposed reserves (in green) as developed by the Bellingham Bay Demonstration Pilot Work Group (Figure from Anchor Environmental 2000).	246

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Nooksack Basin Salmonid Stock Status.	49
Table 2. Salmonid Stock Status in the Smaller Independent Watersheds of WRIA 1.....	54
Table 3. Known and possible barriers to fish passage in WRIA 1. Arranged in priority order from “high”, “medium”, “low”, then “unknown”. Many of the unknown barriers identified by the City of Bellingham have not been assessed. Because of this, not all of them are likely passage problems for salmonids.....	60
Table 4. Landslide estimates in various regions of the South Fork Nooksack Basin. ...	128
Table 5. Pool habitat and LWD in Bertrand, Kamm, and McCormick Creeks (data from Nooksack Salmon Enhancement Association Intern monitoring program)... ..	144
Table 6. Canopy conditions in Bertrand Creek (data from Nooksack Salmon Enhancement Association Intern Monitoring Program).	149
Table 7. Floodplain ratings for Lake Whatcom tributaries (data from DNR 1997).....	197
Table 8. Instream LWD and Deep Pool Habitat in Squalicum Creek (data from Nooksack Salmon Enhancement Association Intern monitoring program).....	199
Table 9. Estimated Canopy Cover Conditions in Squalicum Creek (data from Nooksack Salmon Enhancement Association Intern monitoring program).....	203
Table 10. Water temperature and dissolved oxygen sampling summary in Squalicum, Whatcom, Padden, and Chuckanut Creeks (data from City of Bellingham 1999). ..	210
Table 11. Number and spawning locations of baitfish stocks in WRIA 1 (data from Pentilla 2001a).....	247
Table 12. Source documents for the development of standards.....	249
Table 13. Salmonid habitat condition standards.	250
Table 14. System for rating estuarine habitat conditions.....	258
Table 15. Summary of estuarine and nearshore conditions in WRIA 1.....	259
Table 16. Summary of WRIA 1 Freshwater Limiting Factors Results.....	261

List of Maps (Maps are located in a separate file.)

Map 1 WRIA 1 Location Within Washington State

Map F1 Early Chinook Distribution

Map F2 Fall Chinook Distribution

Map F3 Chinook Distribution

Map F4 Chum Distribution

Map F5 Coho Distribution

Map F6 Pink Distribution

Map F7 Sockeye Distribution

Map F8 Steelhead Distribution

Map F9 Cutthroat Distribution

Map F10 Northern Char Distribution

Map F11 Eastern Brook Trout Distribution

Map F12 Kokanee Distribution

Map S1 Shoreline Modifications

Map S2 Boat Ramps, Piers, and Slips

Map S3 Eelgrass Beds

Map S4 Shoreline Riparian vegetation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

In the last few decades, many salmonid populations in Washington State have declined, leading to the inclusion of bull trout and Puget Sound chinook salmon on the Endangered Species List. In response, the Washington State Legislature passed several bills to address the problem in a logical, concerted manner. Two key pieces of legislation (Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2496 and Second Engrossed Second Substitute Senate Bill 5596, now 77RCW) initiated the process towards the development of “Habitat Limiting Factors” reports.

This report is the habitat limiting factors project for WRIA 1, the Nooksack Basin. It provides a consolidation of existing habitat information in a Statewide consistent format, and rates various categories of habitat conditions. The habitat categories include fish habitat access, floodplain, sediment, streambed, riparian, water quality, flow, estuarine and nearshore conditions. Each of those conditions are rated as either “poor”, “fair”, “good”, or “data gap”, based upon a set of standards that are described in the Assessment Chapter. This Executive Summary presents only an overview of the worst habitat problems, but all the habitat ratings are provided in Tables 15 and 16 in the Assessment Chapter. More importantly, detailed discussions for each of these habitat conditions can be found within the Habitat Limiting Factors Chapter of this report. Maps of updated salmon and steelhead trout distribution and nearshore conditions are located in a separate electronic file on this disc.

The streams addressed in this report include all salmon- and steelhead-producing streams in the following basins: the Nooksack, Dakota, California, Terrell, Squalicum, Whatcom, Lake Whatcom, Padden, Chuckanut, Oyster, Colony, Sumas, Saar, Frost, Selesia, Domfino, Tomyhoi, and the Chilliwack Basins. The Fraser River tributaries include only those portions found in Washington State.

Major Habitat Problems in the Nooksack Basin

Of all the drainages in WRIA 1, the Nooksack is the largest and produces the greatest abundance of salmonids and the greatest number of salmonid stocks. As many as 19 different salmon, steelhead, bull trout, and cutthroat trout stocks are currently identified within the Nooksack Basin, including 4 possible stocks of chinook, 2 native chum stocks, coho, 3 pink stocks, 1 riverine sockeye stock, 4 steelhead stocks, 1 cutthroat stock, and 3 Dolly Varden/bull trout stocks.

Most of the salmonid spawning habitat in the Nooksack Basin is located in the three forks of the Nooksack River. However, much of this area has considerable sedimentation problems, most originating from landslides. In the South Fork Nooksack sub-basin, more than 1200 landslides have been identified with 37% associated with clearcuts and 32% related to roads. Road densities are generally high, especially in the Hutchinson, Skookum, Edfro, Cavanaugh, Deer, Roaring,

Plumbago, and Howard Creek watersheds and along the middle reaches of the South Fork Nooksack River. The suspended sediment levels in the mainstem South Fork are sometimes higher than in the glacially fed Middle Fork Nooksack River. Sediment transport is further impaired by a lack of large woody debris (LWD), and the excess sedimentation has likely contributed to a lack of adequate pool habitat. In the past, streambed instability and poor gravel quality have been documented in the South Fork Nooksack River, but current conditions are unknown for these parameters.

The North and Middle Fork Nooksack Rivers have a naturally high sediment load due to glacial inputs. However, human-caused sedimentation is considerable. About 480 landslides have been recorded in the Middle Fork Nooksack River sub-basin with 36% linked to roads and 32% associated with clearcuts. Road densities are generally high; as much as 12.6 miles of road per square mile of watershed in Heislars Creek. Most roads are unpaved, which worsens the sedimentation impact. Very little data were found regarding gravel quality, LWD, pool habitat, streambed and channel stability conditions in the Middle Fork Basin.

An estimated 632 landslides have been documented in the North Fork Nooksack sub-basin. Roads have been associated with 36% and clearcuts with 28% of the landslides. Most landslides occurred within 10 years of intense timber harvest in a given area, and the landslide frequency correlates well to forest practice activity both temporally and spatially. Landslide densities are especially high in the Cornell, Racehorse, Gallop, Boulder, and Coal Creek watersheds with generally high road densities in most of the watersheds downstream of Nooksack Falls. Data were limited for substrate quality, LWD, pools, channel and streambed stability, but where data were available, channel and streambed instability and low levels of LWD were common.

Other habitat problems in the Forks include impacts to riparian, floodplain, water quality and flow conditions, and most of these problems occur in the lower reaches. The lower South Fork Nooksack River has dikes along 60% of its length, and its channel length has decreased by an estimated 37%, likely due to a loss of secondary channels. Riparian conditions are rated “poor” in this same area, as well as in some of the tributaries, such as Black Slough and Hutchinson Creek. Warm water temperatures are a critical problem in the South Fork Nooksack sub-basin with 52% of the samples warmer than 20°C and a peak temperature of 23.9°C in the lower South Fork Nooksack River in 1996. Warm water temperatures have also been documented in Hutchinson, Skookum, Cavanaugh, Roaring, Howard, and Wanlick Creeks, tributaries to the South Fork Nooksack River.

Warm water temperatures have also been recorded in the lower Middle Fork Nooksack River and in Canyon Lake Creek, but water temperatures are a data need in other Middle Fork Nooksack tributaries. Riparian conditions were rated “poor” along the lower Middle Fork Nooksack River and along Rankin Creek,

but were “fair” to “good” elsewhere. There is naturally limited floodplain habitat in the Middle Fork Nooksack sub-basin.

While the lower North Fork Nooksack River has experienced some warm water temperatures, most of the water quality problems are in the tributaries. Warm water temperatures have been documented in lower Boulder, Gallop, lower Canyon, Cornell, Racehorse, Hedrick, and Kenney Creeks. Many of these areas also have degraded riparian and sedimentation conditions; both contribute to water quality problems. While there are some known floodplain impacts in the North Fork Nooksack sub-basin, quantification was lacking and is a data need.

The Nooksack River sub-basin (downstream of the Forks) has a heavily impacted floodplain and very poor riparian conditions throughout the mainstem and most tributaries. The lack of shade, loss of wetlands, and channel changes are probable causes for the warm water temperatures found in the Nooksack River and the Silver, Tenmile, Bertrand, Fishtrap, Kamm, and Anderson Creek watersheds. Also, compared to other rivers in the Puget Sound region, the Nooksack River near Ferndale has among the highest levels of nitrogen (including ammonia and nitrate), phosphorous, turbidity, and suspended solids. From 1979 to 1991, turbidity has increased between 1 to 2% per year in the lower mainstem Nooksack River.

Inadequate stream flows for salmonid habitat are a pervasive problem throughout WRIA 1, and can contribute to water quality problems. Many of the lowland streams and tributaries flow through land converted to agricultural or urban use, which has resulted in channelization, water withdrawals, a loss of wetlands, and altered land cover. More than thirty drainages and mainstem reaches are closed to further water allocations in WRIA 1, particularly targeting the South Fork Nooksack River and Hutchinson and Skookum Creeks, the North Fork Nooksack River and its major tributaries, and the tributaries to the Nooksack River downstream of the Forks. Land cover vegetation has been greatly altered in all of the Nooksack watersheds downstream of the Forks, as well as in watersheds draining to the lower North, South, and Middle Fork Nooksack Rivers. This can impact both high and low flow conditions.

Major Habitat Problems in the Dakota, California, Terrell, Squalicum, Whatcom, Padden, Chuckanut, Oyster, and Colony Creek Watersheds

The smaller, independent drainages provide habitat for coho, cutthroat, steelhead, chum, and to a lesser degree, chinook. Potentially low stream flows are also believed to be a problem in many of these streams. Dakota, California, Terrell, Squalicum, Whatcom, Padden, and Chuckanut Creeks all have closures for further water allocations, and existing water rights are numerous. The land cover vegetation has also been greatly altered, increasing the likelihood of water flow impacts. Impervious surfaces are rated “poor” in the Terrell and Colony Creeks, and are probably poor in Squalicum, Whatcom and Padden Creeks. Warm water temperatures have been documented in Dakota, Squalicum,

Whatcom, Padden, and Chuckanut Creek watersheds, and have not been measured in California, Terrell, Oyster, and Colony Creeks. Other toxins, such as pentachlorophenol, and mercury, lead, zinc, and copper have been documented in Whatcom Creek with urban and industrial storm water runoff, the suspected source.

Based upon a broad-scale analysis, riparian conditions are tentatively rated “poor” in the watersheds of Dakota, California, Terrell, Squalicum, Whatcom, Padden, Chuckanut, Oyster, and Colony Creeks, but reach-specific data were lacking. Low levels of LWD were noted in Squalicum along with streambed instability. No other data on stability, LWD, pools, or sedimentation were found for any of the above-listed streams. Floodplain conditions are believed to be “poor” in Dakota, California, and Squalicum Creeks due to wetland loss or bank hardening. No other data on floodplain or fish access conditions were found for these streams.

The Lake Whatcom sub-basin supports native cutthroat and kokanee populations. Its tributaries are impacted by landslides in the upper reaches and floodplain degradations such as bank hardening in the lower reaches. Low levels of LWD exist throughout, and streambed stability has ranged from “fair” to “poor”. Warm water temperatures and degraded riparian conditions are also common in these tributaries. Increased urbanization and residential development are thought to contribute to water quality problems in Lake Whatcom.

Major Habitat Problems in the Fraser River Tributaries

Habitat conditions in the Washington State portion of the Fraser River tributaries vary greatly with land ownership. The upper Chilliwack, Selesia, Domfino, and Tomyhoi watersheds are relatively pristine, located within either National Park Service or U.S. Forest Service boundaries. In contrast, the Sumas River, Saar Creek, and Frost Creek watersheds have extensive impacts to water quality, flow, and riparian vegetation. Levels of nitrogen (including ammonia) and phosphorous in the Sumas River are among the highest levels in the Puget Sound region, and low dissolved oxygen levels have been documented in several Sumas River tributaries. Numerous surface and ground water rights exist throughout the Sumas River watershed, and the Sumas River and Saar Creek are closed to further water allocations. Little information was found for fish access, floodplain, and sediment conditions in these streams. Chum, coho, and cutthroat are found throughout these streams with bull trout/Dolly Varden in the Chilliwack watershed and chinook salmon in the Sumas River.

Habitat Impacts in the WRIA 1 Estuarine and Nearshore Environments

The condition of the estuarine and nearshore habitat in WRIA 1 varies considerably according to location. Estuary habitat loss has been documented in Bellingham, Lummi, and Samish Bays, but no information was found for other

estuaries in WRIA 1. Overall, Whatcom County ranked 8th out of 14 Puget Sound Counties for the percent of modified shoreline miles. Shoreline modifications (bulkheads, rip-rap, fills) were common along Point Roberts, the Peace Arch, Blaine, Birch Bay, Neptune Beach, Sandy Point Shores, Lummi Bay, Bellingham Bay, and Samish Bay. Most of the areas with high percentages of modified shorelines also had poor overhead riparian vegetation. Overwater structures, which can impact eelgrass beds and directly affect salmonid behavior are a concern in the following areas: Arco Pier, Intalco Pier, British Petroleum Pier, Gooseberry Point Ferry Terminal, Lummi Island Ferry Terminal, inner Bellingham Bay, Point Roberts Marina, Blaine Marina, Birch Bay Marina, Sandy Point Shores Marina, and Squalicum Marina.

Water quality (including sediment contamination) is a major problem in inner Bellingham Bay, where 9 of the 134 total Puget Sound contaminated sediment sites were located. Numerous toxins including mercury, arsenic, and PCBs have been found. Some of these are known to cause tumors and suppress immune systems in salmonids. They can also be lethal to benthic organisms, which serve as food for salmonids, resulting in a potential reduction of prey. Also, the toxins accumulate in benthic organisms, contaminating the food web. The locations and sources of these toxins have been located, and cleanup is in the initial planning and negotiation stages.

Other water quality issues in WRIA 1 include creosote treated materials and oil spills. This summer, the Department of Ecology plans to remove 350 tons of beached creosote-treated wood from the Whatcom County shoreline, but more will likely be deposited in the future.

Conclusion

This report consolidates and rates salmonid habitat conditions from the freshwater to nearshore environments and presents a list of data needs. It is one step in a coordinated effort towards salmonid recovery, providing the technical background that can aid in the development of restoration/protection projects, recovery strategy development, and project ranking. As conditions change over time, it is hoped that new information will be used to modify future versions of this analysis.